1	IN THE DISTRI	OT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES	
2	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA		
3		ARLESTON DIVISION	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERIC	)	
5	Plaintiff	)	
6	VS	) November 10, 2014 )	
7	JIAN-YUN DONG, et al,	) )	
8	Defendant	s )	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY OF		
	AGENT LARRY LEONARD  BEFORE THE HONORABLE C. WESTON HOUCK,		
10		TTED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
11	APPEARANCES:		
12	For the Plaintiff:	MR. ERIC KLUMB MR. NATHAN WILLIAMS	
13		Office of the United States Attorney P.O. Box 978	
14		Charleston, SC 29402	
15	For the Defendant: Jian-Yun Dong	MS. ROSE MARY PARHAM Parham Law Office	
16	oran ran bong	P.O. Box 1514 Charleston, SC 29503	
17		·	
18		MR. RUSSELL W. MACE, III Russell Mace and Associates	
19		1341 44th Avenue North Suite 205	
20		Myrtle Beach, SC 29577	
21	Vaxima, Inc. GenPhar Inc.	G. WELLS DICKSON, JR. Wells Dickson	
22		124 S. Academy Street Kingstree, SC 29556	
23	Court Reporter:	Amy C. Diaz, RPR, CRR	
24		P.O. Box 835 Charleston, SC 29402	
25	<u> </u>	corded by mechanical shorthand, computer-aided transcription.	

1 2 THE COURT: All right. Call your next witness. 3 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Your Honor. The Government calls Agent Larry Leonard. 4 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand and left 5 6 hand on the Bible. 7 State your name for the record. 8 THE WITNESS: Larry Leonard. THEREUPON: 9 10 AGENT LARRY LEONARD, 11 Called in these proceedings and after having been first duly 12 sworn testifies as follows: 13 MR. WILLIAMS: And, Your Honor, if it pleases the 14 Court? I have three exhibits that I had wished to publish to the jury. I intend to do that at this time under the three 15 16 shareholder letters that had been previously admitted through 17 both Ron Paquette and Elaine Van Voris today. I have reserved publication. And if it pleases the Court, I will 18 read the proper excerpts from those at this time. 19 20 THE COURT: Well, let's go ahead and examine this 21 witness. He's here, we can handle those documents any time 22 we need to. 23 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. WILLIAMS: 24 THE COURT: He has no connection to them. He's on the stand. Let's get rid of his testimony and move forward. 25

1 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. WILLIAMS: 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. WILLIAMS: Q. Sir, tell the jury where you work. 4 A. I work for the Defense Criminal Investigative Services in 5 Charleston, South Carolina. 6 7 Q. What is the Defense Criminal Investigative Services? 8 A. It is the investigative arm of the Department of Defense 9 Inspector General's Office. 10 Q. How long have you been with DCIS? A. It's called DCIS. 11 12 Q. How long have you been with DCIS? A. I think it's 33 years. Since 1985. 1.3 Q. What did you do before you worked at DCIS, if anything? 14 15 A. I was a Special Agent with the Naval Investigative 16 Service, now known as NCIS, in Washington D.C., and I was a 17 Special Agent with them for approximately four years. 18 Q. Did you do anything before that, educational background 19 that qualified you to work for NCIS? 20 A. 1976 I graduated from the Citadel with a Bachelor of 21 Science Degree in electrical engineering. I went into -- two 22 weeks after I graduated, I joined the United States Navy as 23 an officer. My last two years on active duty in 1979 through 24 1981 was as an intelligence analyst at the Naval Investigative Service Headquarters. 25

Q. How did you end up back in Charleston? 1 2 A. Approximately 10 years ago -- I spent most of my career in the Washington D.C. area. Just about everybody in my 3 organization, since it's relatively small, knew that I was 4 originally from Charleston, but we didn't have an office in 5 6 In 2003 I was asked to come down here to South Carolina. 7 open an office. In June of 2004 I came down here to join a 8 government task force run by the Department of Justice 9 involving court security and counterterrorism. 10 Q. And how long were you with that group before you went to 11 your own office? 12 A. Well, part of the agreement when I came down here was that I would be a part of that task force. But in my spare 1.3 time I was to work DCIS cases, which are traditionally 14 15 contract fraud, corruption and the like. So I had a caseload 16 of DCIS-related cases. And I also worked on the task force. 17 Q. Are there other agents now since you started that office, 18 other DCIS agents, as well? 19 A. Since the office started here, two other agents have been 20 added. And I am not officially -- two years ago I was

Q. Did you --

21

22

23

25

- A. But I actually work out of here.
- Q. Did you sort of retire?
  - A. I did sort of retire.

reassigned to our headquarters in Arlington, Virginia.

Q. You signed back up and are now working cases? 1 2 A. I don't -- these cases are still the ones that were left 3 over before I was reassigned to headquarters. Q. So what type of cases, at least most recently, have you 4 been an investigator on? What type of work do you do? 5 A. Primarily throughout my career has been involved in 6 7 contract fraud, public corruption, including bribery, 8 kickbacks in contracts, but all contracts involving the Department of Defense, either the Department of Defense as a 9 10 whole or one of the military agencies. 11 Q. And you are familiar, obviously with the case you are 12 here for in court today, involving Dr. Dong, GenPhar and Vaxxima? 1.3 14 A. Yes, I am. Q. At some point in time did you interview -- I don't want 15 to go through your entire investigation -- but at some point 16 17 in time did you interview John Dong in this case? 18 A. Yes, I did. 19 Q. When was the first time you interviewed him? 20 A. August 23rd, 2009. 21 Q. Where did that interview occur? 22 A. It occurred at the FBI office in Mount Pleasant, South 23 Carolina. 24 Q. Was that after -- there had been some talk earlier about

a search warrant -- was that after a search warrant had been

1	executed?
2	A. It was after.
3	Q. And when you interviewed Dr. Dong, was he free to leave?
4	A. Yes, he was.
5	Q. He came in voluntarily or he wasn't under any kind of
6	arrest?
7	A. He actually called me and asked for an interview.
8	Q. And did you read him his rights, at least those that may
9	have applied in that situation?
10	A. I advised him he was free to go and he did not have to
11	answer any of our questions and he could leave at any time.
12	Q. And did you talk to him about the subject of this case,
13	about the grants that were involved in GenPhar?
14	A. Yes, I did.
15	Q. What did he tell you about the grants?
16	A. He described it all the grants were fixed price.
17	Q. Did he explain where they got money from, investment
18	money or anything like that for GenPhar?
19	A. As part of the, you know, the inquiry, we
20	THE COURT: Now, do you have a written statement?
21	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Do you plan to offer that in evidence?
23	MR. WILLIAMS: I wasn't planning on it, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	MR. WILLIAMS: I shouldn't say it's a written

statement; it's a typewritten report of the interview. 1 2 THE COURT: I just didn't want to go through all the 3 details if you were ultimately going to offer the statement. MR. WILLIAMS: That's why I was trying to cut to 4 the chase. 5 THE COURT: That's good. I'm all for that. 6 7 Q. So without getting into all those background details, I 8 think you talked about the grants specifically. Did he indicate in that statement to you what type of investment or 9 10 investor funds they had? A. He indicated that when the company first started, that it 11 12 started with about \$1 million and then --1.3 THE COURT: Let me interrupt. Let me see the 14 lawyers up here just a moment. 15 (At the bench.) 16 THE COURT: I've had criminal cases for a long time, 17 I've tried a lot of criminal cases, but my recollection is 18 that in every one I've had in the past, I've had a 19 voluntariness hearing before the statement was introduced. 20 This is a little bit unique because I knew 21 beforehand that he had voluntarily went in, and I know that 22 he's testified that there is no intention, he was in custody 23 or anything like that, but I do feel like if there is any 24 question about the voluntariness, put it on the record, then

I can have that hearing now outside of the presence of the

jury.

1.3

I don't know what useful purpose it would serve, but it seems to me -- I don't think the rule was now, but I think way back when I first started, you did have to have a hearing before the statement came in. I think now -- I don't know. I didn't anticipate this will happen. I hadn't even thought about it, but I just wanted to open the door and see what anybody thought whether I can do it, alleviate anybody's doubts or fears or concerns about it, the confession in broad terms, and let me know.

What about you?

MR. MACE: Judge, our concern would be we want to make sure that any grant --

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't intend to ask about grant stuff. And it's not going to go into the things I think you are worried about.

MR. MACE: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm not sure I understood you.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think there is some other information in the statements. I'm not going to ask about the -- ask about the -- I mean, I think that's what they are worried about. I'm not going to get into personal things, things like that.

MR. MACE: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: I may ask about lobbying.

THE COURT: You ask him about that after five days 1 2 of trial, I think. 3 MR. WILLIAMS: I think it would be a mistrial at the --4 MR. DICKSON: He didn't sign these documents, or 5 6 these memorandums. 7 They are reports of an interview. MR. WILLIAMS: 8 THE COURT: How many more witnesses do you have? You are up to 20 now. 9 10 We've got three more. MR. WILLIAMS: 11 THE COURT: What is Bob Bickerton doing here? 12 MS. PARHAM: Watching. 1.3 MR. DICKSON: I don't see where he signed them. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: I didn't say he did. I said we have 15 reports of an interview. 16 MR. DICKSON: Okay. We just call them statements. 17 I'm kind of concerned. 18 (In open court.) 19 Q. Agent Leonard, I believe you were starting to talk about 20 what this defendant told you about private investment money 21 when you interviewed him. 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. What did he say? 24 A. The initial investment was approximately \$1 million. then subsequent to that, they received an additional 25

investment, another \$12 million. 1 2 Q. Did he explain more recent investments, as well? 3 A. Yes. Q. What did he explain about recent investments? 4 A. He indicated that he had gotten, I believe \$4 million 5 from Reinhard Hubner, a German investor. 6 7 Q. And did he explain what the status of the investment 8 funds were at the time of the interview in 2009? 9 A. He said at the time of the interview that they had no 10 more, he called it a buffer, with investor funds for the 11 company. 12 Q. Did he explain to you the organization of GenPhar, his role at GenPhar? 1.3 A. Yes. He said he was the President and Chief Executive 14 Officer of the company. 15 Q. Did he explain how he was compensated through GenPhar? 16 A. He did. 17 18 Q. What did he tell you? 19 A. In the first interview, he said that he was paid as a 20 consultant \$150,000 a year. 21 Q. Did he explain at all how grant expenses could be used or 22 not used for the building? 23 A. We did ask how he -- what money the company had available 24 to it. And he indicated there were investor funds, and then he used the term called money earned, which was unfamiliar to 25

me, and grant funds was funds that were coming into the 1 2 company. 3 Q. So did he explain any further, at least at that time, what this money earned concept was? 4 A. He basically said that these were milestone-driven 5 contracts, and most of the milestones were reached. And any 6 7 money leftover was no longer grant money and that it could be 8 used for anything. Q. And did you ask him if that money was used for the 9 10 building? A. I did. 11 12 Q. What was his response? A. He said that money earned was used. 13 Q. Did he indicate whether he thought the grant money could 14 be used for lobbying? 15 A. He indicated that he could not use indirect costs for 16 17 lobbying, but that he could use the money earned for 18 lobbying. 19 Q. So that was on August 26th of 2009, correct? 20 A. That's correct. 21 Q. Did you have a second followup interview with him? 22 A. Yes, I did. 23 Q. And about what day was that, approximately? 24 A. It was December the 23rd, same year, 2009. Q. Were the circumstances of that interview any different? 25

A. Very similar. He called and asked to come in and talk.

The first interview was when it was -- when it was set up, we only -- we knew we only had two hours. He had a conference call that he needed to make, and so we didn't exactly get finished, but we got through most of everything.

But then in December he asked to come back in and to discuss this with us. And so it was basically the same. We met in the -- at the Mount Pleasant FBI Office. Special Agent Olsen from the FBI and myself conducted both interviews. And he went back through that he did not have to answer any questions and he was free to leave.

- Q. And did you ask him any followup questions regarding the corporate structure again of GenPhar and Vaxxima?
- A. I did.

1.3

- Q. And did he explain on December 24th --
- A. He explained that he was the Chief Executive Officer and President. He identified his wife at the time, Dr. Danher Wang, as the Vice President for Research and Chief Scientific Officer. He identified Stephanie Rabon as the bookkeeper. He also said that Linda Richards was employed, I don't know that he meant in that particular sense, but he said she was employed as their accountant. And he also identified an outside auditing firm.
- Q. Did you re-discuss or did you have another discussion about this money earned concept and how the building was paid

1 for? 2 A. We did. I wanted to have him clarify a little better 3 what money earned meant. Q. What did he say? 4 A. Pretty much that it was when they reached a milestone and 5 they were paid by the Government, that that money was earned; 6 7 and as a result, it could be used for other things. 8 Q. Did he ever say that he talked with anybody about that or discussed it with grantors? 9 10 A. We asked him if he had talked to anybody in the United 11 States Government who had told him that. Initially he said 12 that he had not. And the second time, the second interview, he said that he recalled that he talked to somebody but he 1.3 14 didn't know who it was. Q. As far as future interviews, did you have a third 15 16 interview with him? 17 A. Yes. I interviewed him in August of 2010. 18 Q. And was that a similar circumstance where he was free to 19 leave; wasn't forced to be there; was given his rights? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. And in that interview, was there some discussion about 22 grants and possible loans? If you need to refer to your 23 notes, certainly do. 24 A. In August 2010, by that time we knew that the company basically had ceased operation. So he came in and indicated 25

that they did not have any funds left. 1 2 Q. Did he have any plan to try to complete the building at 3 that time? The company had obtained a first mortgage, a 4 A. He did. loan for the building, in November 2009 after the search 5 warrant. And during this meeting, he said that they were not 6 7 able to pay the mortgage or get an additional loan to pay for 8 the completion of the building. Q. Was there any -- did you have an understanding based on 9 10 your conversations with him that he was able to obtain 11 additional investor funds at that point in time? 12 A. At that time, no. 13 Q. Did that come up in a later interview? 14 A. Yes. Q. As far as from that interview, did he give any opinion as 15 16 to whether grant funds could be spent on other projects? 17 A. Yes. He has maintained that all along. 18 Q. That it could or that it couldn't be? 19 A. Well, if the questioning was put to him as, Could you use 20 grant funds to do this? His answer would be no. But then he 21 would turn around and say that money earned from the grants 22 could be. 23 Q. And did -- I believe he told you something to the effect 24 of earning that money? MR. MACE: Objection, leading, Your Honor. 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

rule was in grants?

THE COURT: I'm going to permit it. We are trying to shorten the time, and I think sometimes leading questions help. And I don't think the question here is helping the witness answer. I think his answer is going to be the same whether it's leading or not. So go ahead. Q. Did he discuss with you whether he thought the money diverted to the GenPhar building was justifiable? A. Well, he kind of rejected the idea of diverting money. He thought that was illegal to divert money. But he did think that the money being used in this building was justifiable even in the proposals that were submitted. Q. And then I believe you said you had one other interview with him. A. That's correct. Q. Let me go back -- there was one other thing in that August 13th interview. Did he talk to you about his -- well, let me ask you: In any of these interviews, did he talk with you about his understanding of how grants work? A. Yes, he did. Q. What was his explanation of his understanding of grants? A. I'm not sure I understand your question. Q. Did he ever tell you how he knew about grants or what his

A. Well, he said that he had worked with grants for many

years and he considered himself to be well-versed with 1 2 regards to grants. 3 Q. And I believe that came up in a 2011 interview? A. That's correct. 4 Q. And was that the last interview that you had with the 5 6 defendant? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. That was what day? A. That was in September, um, September the 16th, 2011. 9 10 Q. And so what did he tell you about his understanding of 11 grants? 12 A. He said that he was very knowledgeable of grants; that he sat on committees to evaluate grants and he considered 1.3 himself to be more knowledgeable than most with regards to 14 grants and grant receivers. 15 He also indicated that as the President and CEO of a 16 17 corporation receiving grants, that he was responsible for 18 reading the grant and then following the rules and 19 regulations associated with. 20 Q. And did he tell you in that interview whether he had a 21 new investor in GenPhar? 22 A. Yes, he did. 23 Q. What was his explanation of the new investor, what he may 24 or may not have told the investor?

A. The new investor was an investor from Hong Kong. And we

asked him if he had informed this investor of the ongoing 1 2 investigation, and he said that he had not. 3 Q. As far as this issue with time sheets, did you ask him whether he had any role in how the time sheets were filled 4 5 out? A. He said he was knowledgeable with regards to how the time 6 7 sheets were filled out. And he also made a comment, I don't 8 remember exactly which interview it was in, but it was to the effect that GenPhar employees were not authorized to put 9 10 their time on their time sheets if it was not for work they 11 had not done. 12 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Agent Leonard. Nothing 1.3 else. 14 MR. MACE: Thank you, Judge. Would it be permissible for me to see the documents 15 16 that Agent Leonard is refreshing his recollection? 17 THE COURT: Sure. 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. MACE: 20 Q. Agent Leonard, the style of the caption of the documents 21 you are using to refresh your recollection with, it says "Qui 22 Tam Claim" on it, right? 23 A. The header on the document, yes. 24 Q. Okay. And I think the ladies and gentlemen of the jury already know this --25

1.3

THE COURT: I didn't know he was refreshing his recollection.

MR. MACE: I believe he was, Judge. I believe Mr. Williams asked him and he has been looking down at those documents during his testimony.

THE COURT: Well, I think we need to put that on the record. I think that the jury has the obligation of judging this witness's credibility. And if there is anything about his testimony that may be relevant, they have the right and we have the obligation to tell them what it is.

Now, we have been through -- yes, sir?

MR. WILLIAMS: I was going to make the record whenever Your Honor wanted. I can ask him those questions.

THE COURT: We have been through the refreshing of a witness's recollection on several occasions. Today Mr. Klumb followed a little different procedure than he did the other day to the point where I commented to my clerk and wanted a break. I said, I finally got somebody to read a rule because it was obvious that he had read the Rule. I don't know whether it was 608, 602, whatever it is, and asked for permission to refresh the witness's recollection, showed the exhibit, had it approved, went through the procedures outlined in the Rule where that hadn't been done before.

Now, here we have a witness who is testifying from a document, and we need to have that document identified so

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the jury will know what he's using to prompt himself during this testimony. That's crucial, it seems to me, or could be crucial in the jury's mind as to judging his credibility. Now, what is it he's using, and has he used this throughout his testimony? MR. WILLIAMS: I can ask those questions, Your Honor. EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS: Q. Agent Leonard, you have some documents with you? A. I do. Q. What are they? A. They are the four reports of the interview that we have been talking about with Dr. Dong. Q. Have you referred to those on occasion in your testimony to refresh your recollection? A. Well, I did look at them, but I didn't have my glasses on, so I really couldn't read them. But yes, I did look at them. Q. So you weren't testifying from those documents; you just had them there sort of as a crutch? A. Pretty much. Q. So they weren't used to refresh your recollection so much as should that have come up, you may be able to --

A. I couldn't find them on the pages. 1 2 THE COURT: Come around, Mr. Williams, and be sworn, 3 please. Okay. MR. WILLIAMS: Does that suffice, Your Honor? 4 THE COURT: Anything you want to add to it? I'm not 5 trying to do anything except paint the proper picture for the 6 7 jury. 8 MR. MACE: Judge, my recollection is that Mr. 9 Williams asked Agent Leonard several times several different 10 questions, and Agent Leonard looked down and put his glasses 11 on and reviewed those documents. 12 THE COURT: Well, I watched him throughout his testimony and I usually pick up on that, and I didn't pick up 13 on it. So if he looked down, he wasn't constantly reading 14 anything or I would have noticed it, I think, and the jury 15 16 would have, as well, and --17 MR. WILLIAMS: I can mark those as an exhibit just 18 to be safe. That's fine with me. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 20 Thank you, Judge. MR. MACE: 21 Q. The documents that you generated, the style of the 22 caption, it's called "Qui Tam Claim"; is that correct? 23 A. That's correct. 24 Q. And that refers to a civil case? 25 A. Actually, what that refers to is a requirement

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

involving -- any time we have an investigation that initiated under qui tam, it has to have that header on it so that it does not -- because it is sealed -- that it does not get released accidentally. So that header is placed on any case that comes in initially as a qui tam until it is unsealed. Q. Okay. But are all of your reports that you generated while interviewing Dr. Dong, do they all say qui tam on them? A. I believe they do. Q. So going back to my original question: This started out as a civil qui tam claim? A. The initial complaint came in as a qui tam claim, correct. Q. And how were you assigned to that qui tam claim? A. Well, I got a call from the Department of Justice that a qui tam had been filed involving the Department of Defense. There was going to be a meeting with the relators of that. I think I got the actual complaint a day or two maybe or each on the day of, I don't remember at this point, about the qui tam. I reviewed it; participated in the initial meeting with Special Agent Dimler and two or three AUSAs from the U.S. Attorney's Office here in Columbia. And that's pretty much the way normal procedure is for any of these kind of allegations. Q. Okay. And are those relators Elaine Van Voris that testified here earlier today?

- A. I think her name is Elaine.
  - Q. Elaine. And then was Johnston the other one?
  - A. Peter Van Voris and then John Johnston.
  - Q. So you met with them. That was the initial stage of your involvement in this case?

## A. That's correct.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it's kind of confusing. Most people have never heard of a qui tam suit. But it is a lawsuit that is brought almost always -- I can be corrected by counsel if I'm wrong -- but it's almost always brought by a whistle blower. And it's brought against some institution claiming that they have made false claims against the Federal Government. They can be brought against hospitals where it was claimed that they used improper influences to get doctors to come practice in their hospital so that their Medicare payments would grow, and whistle blowers in the hospital brought the qui tam litigation.

It's brought, it's investigated, and then as I mentioned the other day, it's sealed. And that's the status of it here today. I've never seen it. That aspect of this case was sent before Judge Gergel who sits in the same spot I do over in the other building. And he has that case and he routinely signed an order of seal. We normally sign them. And it could go on for a year or longer before the seal is broken.

1	Any other explanation you want me to give to them?	
2	MR. MACE: No, sir, that's sufficient.	
3	THE COURT: As far as and it is a suit for a	
4	false claim and it's a suit for damages. Okay.	
5	MR. MACE: Thank you, Judge.	
6	Q. Agent Leonard, just briefly, Dr. Dong voluntarily came to	
7	see you at the FBI Office?	
8	A. Yes, he did.	
9	Q. How many times?	
10	A. At the FBI Office, I think it was three times.	
11	Q. And then the last time where did he come see you?	
12	A. The last interview was with his attorney at the U.S.	
13	Attorney's Office in Columbia.	
14	Q. Okay. But again, you didn't force him to come in; he	
15	voluntarily wanted to come see you?	
16	A. We generally don't force people to come in.	
17	Q. Again, he voluntarily came to see you?	
18	A. Yes.	
19	MR. MACE: Thank you.	
20	MR. DICKSON: My usual one question.	
21	THE COURT: You can ask all the questions you want	
22	to.	
23	MR. DICKSON: But I only want to ask these two.	
24	CROSS-EXAMINATION	
25	BY MR. DICKSON:	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Agent Leonard, you determined there were about 12 or \$13 million in original investments in GenPhar? A. That was what he reported. Q. You didn't try to confirm it? A. We had an auditor assigned to the investigation to go through the books and records. Q. I couldn't quite hear you. A. I said we had an auditor assigned to the investigation. There were five agencies involved in this case: The FBI, DCIS, NCIS, United States Army Criminal Investigation Division, HHS, and we also had an auditor from the Defense Contract Audit Agency. And so for the most part all --THE COURT: Wait a minute. I don't know whether you are going into what the auditor said or not, but I think you've answered the question. Go ahead. Q. You didn't personally determine yourself, is my question? A. I did not. Q. What about the summer of 2010, or at least the last the interview of Dr. Dong in 2010, you had determined through the investigation that GenPhar was broke, had no money, was out of business? A. Yes. Q. That's your answer? A. Yes.

1	Q. I'm sorry. I'm a little hard of hearing. I wanted to be
2	sure I heard you.
3	A. By 2010.
4	Q. Yes.
5	A. Yes.
6	MR. DICKSON: No further questions.
7	THE COURT: Anything further from the Government?
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Not with this witness, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You are excused.
10	****
11	
12	
13	
14	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the
15	record of proceedings in the above-titled matter.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Amy C. Diaz, RPR, CRR November 25, 2014
22	S/ Amy Diaz
23	
24	
25	